

General Editor: Andreas Umland,
Stockholm Centre for Eastern European Studies, andreas.umland@ui.se

Commissioning Editor: Max Jakob Horstmann,
London, mjh@ibidem.eu

EDITORIAL COMMITTEE*DOMESTIC & COMPARATIVE POLITICS

Prof. **Ellen Bos**, *Andrássy University of Budapest*
Dr. **Gergana Dimova**, *University of Winchester*
Dr. **Andrey Kazantsev**, *MGIMO (U) MID RF, Moscow*
Prof. **Heiko Pleines**, *University of Bremen*
Prof. **Richard Sakwa**, *University of Kent at Canterbury*
Dr. **Sarah Whitmore**, *Oxford Brookes University*
Dr. **Harald Wydra**, *University of Cambridge*

SOCIETY, CLASS & ETHNICITY

Col. **David Glantz**, *"Journal of Slavic Military Studies"*
Dr. **Marlène Laruelle**, *George Washington University*
Dr. **Stephen Shulman**, *Southern Illinois University*
Prof. **Stefan Troebst**, *University of Leipzig*
POLITICAL ECONOMY & PUBLIC POLICY
Dr. **Andreas Goldthau**, *Central European University*
Dr. **Robert Kravchuk**, *University of North Carolina*
Dr. **David Lane**, *University of Cambridge*
Dr. **Carol Leonard**, *Higher School of Economics, Moscow*
Dr. **Maria Popova**, *McGill University, Montreal*

FOREIGN POLICY & INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

Dr. **Peter Duncan**, *University College London*
Prof. **Andreas Heinemann-Grüder**, *University of Bonn*
Prof. **Gerhard Mangott**, *University of Innsbruck*
Dr. **Diana Schmidt-Pfister**, *University of Konstanz*
Dr. **Lisbeth Tarlow**, *Harvard University, Cambridge*
Dr. **Christian Wipperfürth**, *N-Ost Network, Berlin*
Dr. **William Zimmerman**, *University of Michigan*
HISTORY, CULTURE & THOUGHT
Dr. **Catherine Andreyev**, *University of Oxford*
Prof. **Mark Bassin**, *Södertörn University*
Prof. **Karsten Brüggemann**, *Tallinn University*
Dr. **Alexander Etkind**, *University of Cambridge*
Dr. **Gasan Gusejnov**, *Moscow State University*
Prof. **Leonid Luks**, *Catholic University of Eichstaett*
Dr. **Olga Malinova**, *Russian Academy of Sciences*
Dr. **Richard Mole**, *University College London*
Prof. **Andrei Rogatchevski**, *University of Tromsø*
Dr. **Mark Tauger**, *West Virginia University*

ADVISORY BOARD*

Prof. **Dominique Arel**, *University of Ottawa*
Prof. **Jörg Baberowski**, *Humboldt University of Berlin*
Prof. **Margarita Balmaceda**, *Seton Hall University*
Dr. **John Barber**, *University of Cambridge*
Prof. **Timm Beichelt**, *European University Viadrina*
Dr. **Katrin Boeckh**, *University of Munich*
Prof. em. **Archie Brown**, *University of Oxford*
Dr. **Vyacheslav Bryukhovetsky**, *Kyiv-Mohyla Academy*
Prof. **Timothy Colton**, *Harvard University, Cambridge*
Prof. **Paul D'Anieri**, *University of Florida*
Dr. **Heike Dörrenbächer**, *Friedrich Naumann Foundation*
Dr. **John Dunlop**, *Hoover Institution, Stanford, California*
Dr. **Sabine Fischer**, *SWP, Berlin*
Dr. **Geir Flikke**, *NUPI, Oslo*
Prof. **David Galbreath**, *University of Aberdeen*
Prof. **Alexander Galkin**, *Russian Academy of Sciences*
Prof. **Frank Golczewski**, *University of Hamburg*
Dr. **Nikolas Gvosdev**, *Naval War College, Newport, RI*
Prof. **Mark von Hagen**, *Arizona State University*
Dr. **Guido Hausmann**, *University of Munich*
Prof. **Dale Herspring**, *Kansas State University*
Dr. **Stefani Hoffman**, *Hebrew University of Jerusalem*
Prof. **Mikhail Ilyin**, *MGIMO (U) MID RF, Moscow*
Prof. **Vladimir Kantor**, *Higher School of Economics*
Dr. **Ivan Katchanovski**, *University of Ottawa*
Prof. em. **Andrzej Korbonski**, *University of California*
Dr. **Iris Kempe**, *"Caucasus Analytical Digest"*
Prof. **Herbert Küpper**, *Institut für Ostrecht Regensburg*
Dr. **Rainer Lindner**, *CEEER, Berlin*
Dr. **Vladimir Malakhov**, *Russian Academy of Sciences*

Dr. **Luke March**, *University of Edinburgh*
Prof. **Michael McFaul**, *Stanford University, Palo Alto*
Prof. **Birgit Menzel**, *University of Mainz-Germersheim*
Prof. **Valery Mikhailenko**, *The Urals State University*
Prof. **Emil Pain**, *Higher School of Economics, Moscow*
Dr. **Oleg Podvintsev**, *Russian Academy of Sciences*
Prof. **Olga Popova**, *St. Petersburg State University*
Dr. **Alex Pravda**, *University of Oxford*
Dr. **Erik van Ree**, *University of Amsterdam*
Dr. **Joachim Rogall**, *Robert Bosch Foundation Stuttgart*
Prof. **Peter Rutland**, *Wesleyan University, Middletown*
Prof. **Marat Salikov**, *The Urals State Law Academy*
Dr. **Gwendolyn Sasse**, *University of Oxford*
Prof. **Jutta Scherrer**, *EHESS, Paris*
Prof. **Robert Service**, *University of Oxford*
Mr. **James Sherr**, *RIIA Chatham House London*
Dr. **Oxana Shevel**, *Tufts University, Medford*
Prof. **Eberhard Schneider**, *University of Siegen*
Prof. **Olexander Shnyrkov**, *Shevchenko University, Kyiv*
Prof. **Hans-Henning Schröder**, *SWP, Berlin*
Prof. **Yuri Shapoval**, *Ukrainian Academy of Sciences*
Prof. **Yuri Shnirelman**, *Russian Academy of Sciences*
Dr. **Lisa Sundstrom**, *University of British Columbia*
Dr. **Philip Walters**, *"Religion, State and Society", Oxford*
Prof. **Zenon Wasyliv**, *Ithaca College, New York State*
Dr. **Lucan Way**, *University of Toronto*
Dr. **Markus Wehner**, *"Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung"*
Dr. **Andrew Wilson**, *University College London*
Prof. **Jan Zielonka**, *University of Oxford*
Prof. **Andrei Zorin**, *University of Oxford*

* While the Editorial Committee and Advisory Board support the General Editor in the choice and improvement of manuscripts for publication, responsibility for remaining errors and misinterpretations in the series' volumes lies with the books' authors.

Soviet and Post-Soviet Politics and Society (SPPS)

ISSN 1614-3515

Founded in 2004 and refereed since 2007, SPPS makes available affordable English-, German-, and Russian-language studies on the history of the countries of the former Soviet bloc from the late Tsarist period to today. It publishes between 5 and 20 volumes per year and focuses on issues in transitions to and from democracy such as economic crisis, identity formation, civil society development, and constitutional reform in CEE and the NIS. SPPS also aims to highlight so far understudied themes in East European studies such as right-wing radicalism, religious life, higher education, or human rights protection. The authors and titles of all previously published volumes are listed at the end of this book. For a full description of the series and reviews of its books, see www.ibidem-verlag.de/red/spps.

Editorial correspondence & manuscripts should be sent to: Dr. Andreas Umland, Department of Political Science, Kyiv-Mohyla Academy, vul. Voloska 8/5, UA-04070 Kyiv, UKRAINE; andreas.umland@cantab.net

Business correspondence & review copy requests should be sent to: *ibidem* Press, Leuschnerstr. 40, 30457 Hannover, Germany; tel.: +49 511 2622200; fax: +49 511 2622201; spps@ibidem.eu.

Authors, reviewers, referees, and editors for (as well as all other persons sympathetic to) SPPS are invited to join its networks at www.facebook.com/group.php?gid=52638198614
www.linkedin.com/groups?about=&gid=103012
www.xing.com/net/spps-ibidem-verlag/

Recent Volumes

- 230 *Christopher Ford*
UKAPISME—Une Gauche Perdue
Le marxisme anti-colonial dans la révolution ukrainienne
1917 - 1925
Avec une préface de Vincent Prémuey
ISBN 978-3-8382-0899-2
- 231 *Anna Kutkina*
Between Lenin and Bandera
Decommunization and Multivocality in Post-Euromaidan
Ukraine
With a foreword by Juri Mykkänen
ISBN 978-3-8382-1506-8
- 232 *Lincoln E. Flake*
Defending the Faith
The Russian Orthodox Church and the Demise of Religious Pluralism
With a foreword by Peter Martland
ISBN 978-3-8382-1378-1
- 233 *Nikoloz Samkharadze*
Russia's Recognition of the Independence of Abkhazia and South Ossetia
Analysis of a Deviant Case in Moscow's Foreign Policy Behavior
With a foreword by Neil MacFarlane
ISBN 978-3-8382-1414-6
- 234 *Arve Hansen*
Urban Protest
A Spatial Perspective on Kyiv, Minsk, and Moscow
With a foreword by Julie Wilhelmsen
ISBN 978-3-8382-1495-5
- 235 *Eleonora Narvselius, Julie Fedor (Eds.)*
Diversity in the East-Central European Borderlands
Memories, Cityscapes, People
ISBN 978-3-8382-1523-5
- 236 *Regina Elsner*
The Russian Orthodox Church and Modernity
A Historical and Theological Investigation into Eastern Christianity between Unity and Plurality
With a foreword by Mikhail Suslov
ISBN 978-3-8382-1568-6
- 237 *Bo Petersson*
The Putin Predicament
Problems of Legitimacy and Succession in Russia
With a foreword by J. Paul Goode
ISBN 978-3-8382-1050-6
- 238 *Jonathan Otto Pohl*
The Years of Great Silence
The Deportation, Special Settlement, and Mobilization into the Labor Army of Ethnic Germans in the USSR, 1941–1955
ISBN 978-3-8382-1630-0

Mikhail Minakov (Ed.)

INVENTING MAJORITIES

Ideological Creativity in Post-Soviet Societies

ibidem
Verlag

Bibliografische Information der Deutschen Nationalbibliothek

Die Deutsche Nationalbibliothek verzeichnet diese Publikation in der Deutschen Nationalbibliografie; detaillierte bibliografische Daten sind im Internet über <http://dnb.d-nb.de> abrufbar.

Bibliographic information published by the Deutsche Nationalbibliothek

Die Deutsche Nationalbibliothek lists this publication in the Deutsche Nationalbibliografie; detailed bibliographic data are available in the Internet at <http://dnb.d-nb.de>.

ISBN-13: 978-3-8382-1641-6

© *ibidem*-Verlag, Stuttgart 2022

Alle Rechte vorbehalten

Das Werk einschließlich aller seiner Teile ist urheberrechtlich geschützt. Jede Verwertung außerhalb der engen Grenzen des Urheberrechtsgesetzes ist ohne Zustimmung des Verlages unzulässig und strafbar. Dies gilt insbesondere für Vervielfältigungen, Übersetzungen, Mikroverfilmungen und elektronische Speicherformen sowie die Einspeicherung und Verarbeitung in elektronischen Systemen.

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in or introduced into a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form, or by any means (electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise) without the prior written permission of the publisher. Any person who does any unauthorized act in relation to this publication may be liable to criminal prosecution and civil claims for damages.

Printed in the EU

Contents

Mikhail Minakov

Ideological Creativity. Introduction to Post-Soviet
Ideologies..... 7

I Self, Otherness, and Ideology

Natalia Kudriavtseva

1 Reconfiguring Identities within the Cityscape: Ideologies
of Ukraine’s Decommunization Renaming..... 27

Petra Colmorgen

2 The Friends So Far, the Foes So Near? Ambiguities of
Georgia’s Othering 55

Nadiia Koval and Ioan Gomza

3 The Splendid School Assembled: Studying and Practicing
International Relations in Independent Ukraine..... 85

Augusto Dala Costa

4 Toponymy and the Issues of Memory and Identity on the
Post-soviet Tbilisi Cityscape..... 141

Roman Horbyk, Yana Prymachenko and Yuliya Yurchuk

5 Mediatization of History: Introducing the Concept and
Key Cases from Eastern Europe 177

II Post-Soviet Sovereigntism in Comparative Perspective

Oleksandr Fisun and Nataliya Vinnykova

6 The Rise of Precarious States: A Shadow Side of
Sovereignty Loss..... 205

	<i>Ruslan Zaporozhchenko</i>	
7	Sovereignty as a Vocation and Profession: Imperial Roots, Current State, Possible Prospects.....	231
	<i>Mikhail Minakov</i>	
8	Sovereignty as a Contested Concept: The Cases of Trumpism and Putinism.....	281
	<i>Gulnara Shaikhutdinova</i>	
9	Implementing International Human Rights Law: Recent Sovereignist and Nationalist Trends	321
	<i>Yurii Mielkov</i>	
10	The Evolution of Sovereignty: From Nation State to Human Person	343
	On the Authors	363
	Index.....	369

Ideological Creativity

Introduction to Post-Soviet Ideologies

Mikhail Minakov

The Ontological Foundations of Human Creativity

Human being is an existence with a capacity for creative self-realization in the world. “To be” means to participate in the world’s continual change, to re-interpret it and to launch new beginnings within it. Each human presence in the world is limited by the time span of individual existence, from birth to death. Yet human presence transcends these limits due to the intersubjectivity of individual existence and to the interobjectivity of the material change resulting from humans’ creative presence in the world. As human beings we are born into the world created before us (by human and non-human existences), and we leave it with our addition to it. Human beings are a part of the many forces participating in a creative interplay of the world’s creation and re-creation.

This philosophical proposition also translates into the ontology of politics. Politics is one of several spheres in which human creative existence—individual and collective—is dominant. To study politics and its many phenomena means to add to the understanding of what human being/s is/are in his/her/their individual-collective ontological interwovenness of (co)presence.

Authority and subjection, conflict and agreement, freedom and serfdom, justice and crime, citizenship and statelessness, individual and common good—these and many other political phenomena stem from our transpersonal copresence. In this copresence humans are doomed to communicate, to reach for conclusions and to implement them together. Such communication is a rich process, one that allows human individuals to convey their conditions: formulated as equality or inequality, an active or passive position, a central or marginal role, acceptance or resistance vis-à-vis the results of yet another communicative act. And each act is an act of

creation, a decision that alters a human's behavior and the material conditions of their life, their social reality.

Imagery is an important part of social reality. Human imagination is a complex cognitive act which unites various other human cognitive faculties in reaching out toward stable cognitive posits – ideas, conclusions, beliefs – that translate into action and change of reality. Basically, by creating imagery and causing a change in reality, the human imagination can be understood as one of human creativity's key elements.

Creativity and Imagination

The imagination is an object of study from many perspectives, including philosophy, psychology, sociology and political science.

In *philosophy*, imagination is interpreted as a cognitive operation with a thing or situation, whereby all rational categories are applied to the possible object of sensation that is not given at the time (Plato 1989; Aristotle 1964; Vico 1956; Kant 2013; Heidegger 1997; Ricoeur 1994; Cocking 2005; Bottici 2014). For over two thousand years, imagination was considered a faculty joining fantasy (Plato, Aristotle) and productivity (Kant), and enabling an understanding of other humans and/or being itself (Heidegger, Ricoeur). A concise resume to this line of philosophical argumentation was offered by Paul Ricoeur, who famously defined the imagination as a cognitive act that can simultaneously be used:

to think of things, which are not present in the current perception, but which can exist,
to create in the mind images of things that do not and cannot exist, and
to bring about images representing things, persons, and/or ideas. (Ricoeur 1994: 120ff)

Which means that imagination unites aspects of fantasy, virtuality and possibility in cognition.

Another cognitive aspect of imagination is problem-solving. The pragmatists have interpreted the imagination as a key human faculty for managing situations of uncertainty by merging work with the past (memory), work with the future (fantasy), and work with the current situation (intelligence). In doing so, imagination

creates a list of possible solutions (Dewey 1998: 32, 87ff, 189ff; Rorty 1998: 167ff).

However, the imagination has other, non-cognitive dimensions that are critical for understanding individual and collective human life. Those dimensions actually include emotional, social, political, cultural and other aspects. From the existential point of view, human life consists of many acts, which also involve projections and existential acts of fulfilling the projected, allowing the projected to be (Husserl 1980; Heidegger 1996, 1997; Sartre 2001). Here the imagination plays the huge role of making these acts meaningful, possible, and creative.

Philosophers also see imagination as a critical human faculty for constructing social reality and selves in correlation with collective identities. This social dimension of imagination is equally studied in social phenomenology (Berger & Luckman 1956; Schutz & Luckman 1960), philosophical critique (Castoriadis 1987, 1997a, 1997b; Marcuse 1991; Fadieiev 2021), and political philosophy (Taylor 1989, 2004; Honnet 1995). The common ground here is the understanding of imagination as the main source of meaning in social life, providing human individuals and collectives with a framework for the interpretation and practical change of reality.

Contemporary psychology tests many ideas discussed by philosophers. However, psychology's major focus has been on the imagination's ability to connect ideal and material spheres in human feeling and action. From this point of view, imagination is a higher psychological function, aiming to "build things acting as if they were abstractions, and build abstractions acting as if they were real things," and thus to transcend the dichotomy of ideal and material (Tateo 2015a: 146, 2015b: 4ff).

The synthetic and productive force of imagination also transcends the individual-collective dichotomy. For example, in her empirical psychology studies, Jacqueline Adams found that "the imagination permeates our decision-making, routinely enters our thoughts, is a domain in which individuals immerse themselves regularly, and, in the form of collective imaginings, can inspire social change" (Adams 2004: 277). This and many other studies (Newman 1993; Pileggi et al. 2000; Kane et al. 2007; Zittoun and Cerchia

2013; Oklopcic 2018) show that imagination is a central function of mind, which constantly brings the individual psyche out of a now-reality into some other “space,” and this “space” is of a transpersonal or intersubjective nature (Killingsworth and Gilbert 2010; Schooler et al. 2011; Mooneyham and Schooler 2013; Smallwood 2013). These “mind travels” seem to be another way of describing the imagination’s power to offer alternative situations as problem-solving or adaptational practices.

Psychologists also show the imagination’s rootedness in collective human presence. For example, Adams (2004) concludes from her studies of decision-making in cross-cultural families:

Finally, class and nationality may be among the shapers of the imagination. Of those in the middle class, dreams might be different from those of the working class... Many people from the same nation have shared imaginings, or collective fantasies, and different cultures have different imaginative traditions or themes. The shared imaginings can be about other people... (Adams 2004: 294–5)

These social and political roots link contemporary psychology and political sciences with respect to their interest in imagination.

Political science studies imagination as an important aspect of human participation in political life. One example can be a vision of the past, present and future shared by a political community or society. In a recent study of political imagination, researchers found that the “process of imagination extends not only to how we anticipate the development of our personal lives, but also how we envision the future of our social groups, be they micro-groups such as families, or macro-groups such as nations or even the fate of humanity itself” (De Saint-Laurent et al. 2018: 4). Imagination turns individuals into participants and co-authors of transpersonal, imaginary – and thus, socially real and affectively perceived – worlds.

Special attention is paid to the political creativity that merges the “unreal” projections (fantasies) with “real” political consequences through an interplay of present, future and past. Tania Zittoun and Alex Gillespie (2018) studied several cases in which the political imagination of the future was applied for the same

situation as our study: the quest to remedy collective traumas. In their study they show that:

Imagination [of collective future] involves a three-step sequence. First, there is a trigger—usually, disruptions of some kind questioning a person’s involvement in a current conduct that initiate the person’s uncoupling from the proximal sphere of experience... Second, the burgeoning loop of imagination utilizes resources—drawn from a wide range of semiotic and material elements previously internalized by the person along the life course, or present in the immediate environment, through the presence of others, the affordances of the setting, or the power of guidance of complex artefacts... Third, the sequence ends with a return—when the person loops out of imagining, and recouples with her proximal circumstances, a few seconds or hours older. (Zittoun & Gillespie 2018: 17)

Such processes took place when dissidents, or the politicians who brought down the Berlin Wall, or started Perestroika in USSR, imagined a free post-communist world (*ibid.*, 19–20).

The use of time in political imagination preconditions the understanding of common good, of who belongs to the groups deemed to be legitimate participants, and of the rules of political actions. In these terms, the imagination of the past, in terms of collective memories, is one of the constant factors predefining political action. For example, Constance de Saint-Laurent (2018) analyzed the political imagination of the past in terms of “collective memories.” Her studies show three main models of the political use of the past (collective memory, history):

history as a “frame of reference, determining the main actors and the roles they should play in the future”; history as “a source of experiences and examples” of what is “likely, possible, or desirable”; and history as “generalizable experience from which global representations of the world can be built, which in turn, inform the imagination of collective futures” (de Saint-Laurent 2018: 64).

So imagination of the past represents a faculty of specific conservative creativity that deals with phenomena from academic historical imagination to radical nostalgia with political consequences.

The political imagination of the future is vested in the understanding of purposes, of possible and impossible plans, of virtual problems and disasters. The radical imagination deals with utopian visions. The functionality of such imagination aims at “keeping us

from becoming complacent with the present” (McBride 10), at looking for “new beginnings” (Arendt 1963: 12ff) in spheres of equality, justice and common good.

Ideological Creativity

Keeping the above ontological, theoretical, and empirical arguments in mind, it is important to stress that political ideologies are specific phenomena rooted in human creativity. The imagery that forms, makes sense, and motivates human individuals to participate in political communication and action reveals ideology as a creative force that cannot be separated from humanness itself. This creativity stems from the specificity of the human presence in the world. It is simultaneously a cognitive and practical act in which human life—individual and collective—vests itself. And this ideological creativity makes human participation in politics ontologically, cognitively, and psychologically meaningful.

Creativity and imagination go hand in hand with political processes, power distribution, wealth of choice, and political inclusivity. By continuing Hanna Arendt’s intuition in looking at politics as a sphere of human self-realization and creativity (Arendt 1960, 1963), Vlad Glaveanu, a researcher of political imagination, offered a widely accepted definition:

Creativity is best understood as a form of action in and on the world, performed in relation to others, and leading to the continuous renewal of culture... Creativity and imagination designate the human capacity to generate meaningful novelty in thought and in action. Both processes express our agency and help us expand our range of mental and cultural resources (e.g., ideas, schemas, images, objects, norms, and so on). (Glaveanu 2018: 84–85)

Thus, the political study of imagination proves certain philosophical intuitions, which in turn have inspired political scholars in recognizing creativity as the foundation of political action.

This creativity can manifest itself in the production of ideological positions and beliefs. George Kateb has famously defined this connection as imagery of two kinds: seeing-non-existent and not-seeing-existent, which can also be another definition of ideology (Kateb 2002: 485ff). Kateb, and later Oklopic, also link political

imagination with specific political emotionality. Both researchers prove that different ideologies lead to emotions of different force and kind: ethnonationalism and antiliberal ideologies provoke stronger emotional reactions and more active political imagination than the liberal ideologies (ibid. 500; Oklopcic 2018: 8ff). Thus political imagination, by provoking emotions, leads to collective actions. However, the more rational ideologies have weaker motivations for collective solidarity than less rational ones.

Ideological creativity's conceptualization is based on four elements. First, by merging cognitive, aesthetic and emotional acts with behavioral consequences, imagination has its own ideological materiality. Second, this materiality is connected with human creativity as a faculty to begin anew, to use the past for projecting the future, and to solve present problems by elaborating past experience (personal and collective) and a fantasy of the future. Third, imagination transcends ideal and material, as well as individual and collective, and preconditions political actions in changing the current state of affairs. And finally, the production of imaginary meanings leads to collective/political, materially manifested results. Altogether, ideological creativity can be seen as the existential and functional unity of three aspects of social imagination:

real aspect: imagination is embodied in the social reality, and it participates in its reproduction; intersubjective aspect: imagination refers to the experience of individuals and groups simultaneously; ideal aspect: imagination focuses on alternatives to the state of affairs, offers a utopia or nostalgia as possible solutions.

Ideological creativity as a concept manifests the ability of human existence to cast projections into nothing and fill this nothing with its own presence, thus bringing the project into being. At this level, there is no rationalized division of human existence into categories of individual, collective or humankind; all these divisions are actually the result of ideological creativity, not its foundations.

Ideological creativity as a concept refers to cognitive operations with real and not-yet-real things, processes, ideas, and persons. These operations work with images and imageries, as practice, cognitively projecting a spatio-temporal real and unreal

toward specific ends. The ends of these ideological cognitive processes unite aspects of fantasy, virtuality, and possibility, making possible a change of reality through human action.

Ideological creativity as a concept refers to social practice based on the merger of the collective past (collective memory), collective future (social fantasy), and work on the current situation (transpersonal intelligence). Due to social imagination, ideological creativity translates into the construction of social reality and political selves in correlation with collective identities. This concept reveals Aristotle's definition of politics (as communication about the highest common good) as a complex interpersonal process in which there is simultaneously:

exchange with politically important information; decision-making where real needs and possible solutions meet each other in the conflict and agreement of imageries; distribution, confirmation, and/or change of power position of persons and groups participating in the communication and support of imageries; implementation of and/or resistance to the decisions; (re)production of the political community as living collective of involved political subjects.

Ideological creativity, by merging projections with real political consequences, is the source of meaning in political life that provides human individuals and groups with a framework for the interpretation and practical change of social reality. It is a human faculty allowing us to engage with the world and re-create it toward certain common ends. As such it opens a space for authority and subjection, conflict and agreement, freedom and serfdom, justice and crime, citizenship and statelessness, individual and common good.

Post-Soviet Ideological Creativity

The combination of a future-oriented critique of reality, a problem-solving approach, and the planning of a future state of affairs on one side, with history, memory and nostalgia on the other side, establishes the limits of the ideological imagination in specific historical, cultural, and geographic situations. One such situation is

connected with the experience of people living in Eastern Europe and Northern Eurasia in the late 20th and early 21st centuries.

Soviet and post-Soviet epochs differentiate and interconnect in many ways, and one of them is the ideological specificity of these epochs. Svetlana Boym has meaningfully expressed the Soviet and post-Soviet ideological continuity in the following way:

The twentieth century began with a futuristic utopia and ended with nostalgia. (Boym 2001: 11)

However, utopia and nostalgia are both grounded in real, current problems, and offer common solutions. Thus, ideological creativity always deals with current groups, communities and other types of collectivities that affectively and existentially involve individuals in a life that transcends their own personalities through politics or social action.

In our past study of the post-Soviet ideologies, Alexander Etkind and I (Etkind & Minakov 2020) described the politically driven reimagination of the future and past of the newly established societies. The unpredictable future was wide open and seen as a source of danger. Yet the past, as it was reinvented in the times of Perestroika, was full of threatening imagery as well. For this reason:

The new societies of Eastern Europe and Northern Eurasia faced tectonic transformations, which led to a flourishing of different phenomena related to ideology. But the social structure adapted slowly. The new social reality had to normalize political competition, multiparty systems, private property, the significance of money, the coexistence of consumerist lifestyle and totalitarian traditions, and the contradictions between democratic politics and oligarchic economies, between atheism and religious renaissance, and so on. Events throughout the late 20th and early 21st centuries inspired new ideological frameworks, which allowed individuals, institutions and social groups to accept and interpret the new political and socioeconomic reality in a way that was eclectic, relativistic or – the most popular ideological term of the epoch – post-modern. Though philosophical genealogies of the post-modern and post-Soviet conditions were vastly different – if not opposite – these concepts often merged or conflated in their popular usage. (Etkind & Minakov 2020: 9–10)

In this current collection of research, scholars indicate and analyze specific cases of post-Soviet ideological creativity.

Aims and Structure of This Book

One of the major results of the post-Soviet ideological creativity has been the creation of majorities. In various national contexts the quest for a majority took place over several years (Azerbaijan, the Baltic countries, Kazakhstan, and Uzbekistan) or several decades (Armenia, Kyrgyzstan, and Ukraine). When the ideological and demographic construction of the majority is finished, power elites have an opportunity to legitimize their rule through elections. In cases like the Baltic countries, these elections have a democratic character (though it may not save them from an illiberal turn). In cases like Russia or Kazakhstan, these elections lose their democratic meaning but remain as a provider of legitimacy to the ruling group that “defends the people” (that is, the majority). The ideological construction of majorities was crucial for establishing a government-controlled political order after the Soviet Union’s dissolution.

This book consists of ten research papers dedicated to the ideological construction of new majorities, which have both universal meaning and post-Soviet specificity. Each paper, after a double blind peer-review process, was previously published in the *Ideology and Politics Journal* issues of 2019-2021. Later, these chapters were additionally reviewed and updated by their authors for this publication.

Our book’s chapters are divided into two parts. The first part studies how the new post-Soviet majorities create their own symbolic reality, give names to the significant *topoi* of their collective space, regulate the knowledge of the past in collective time, and prescribe major features that differentiate and link collective selves and others. The intensive instrumental (mis)use of the images of the self and the other has been based on a set of intertwined cultural, ethnic, gender, social and religious stereotypes born in the 18th and 19th centuries, and redefined by the post-Soviet national revivals, civil and world wars, as well as ethnic and religious conflicts aiming to reestablish “historical justice.” The construction of the self and the other in their own country facilitates re-energized identity politics, sometimes in its most extreme forms.

The first part opens with a chapter on the decommunization of place names in the southeastern Ukrainian city of Kryvyi Rih. Natalia Kudriavtseva explores attitudes towards the ongoing renaming among an expert community of researchers from different fields. The working group, organized by the researchers with the aim of developing their own toponymic suggestions to be then publicly discussed, stands here as a separate aspect of the symbolic changes. Employing the sociolinguistic concept of language ideology, the author transforms it from a belief about language into a belief about place name in order to analyze the working group, naming motives and toponymic choices. In a similar way to the ideology which links ethnic identity to language, the toponymic ideologies of the renaming group members are governed by the view that the toponym is an expression of national identity, where a specific historical interpretation functions as a structural piece. The processes structuring these ideologies—iconization, fractal recursivity and erasure—necessarily lead to a selective commemoration of events and historical figures, which are defined by their belonging to the place. As foreseen by the national agenda, “decommunizational” renaming in this local context is also perceived as a reconstruction of identity.

In the second chapter, Petra Colmorgen analyzes the case of Georgia building its post-Soviet national self through the othering of its two most powerful neighbors. Russia and Turkey are constructed to be the other in relation to Westernness and Orthodoxy, two key Georgian identity markers. But perceptions of us versus them are not always led by exclusively negative perceptions, nor are they directed only outwards. On the one hand, Georgia’s othering of Russia and Turkey remains incomplete, because the neighbors also represent characteristics close to aspects of the Georgian majority’s self. On the other hand, a “spillover effect” of othering takes place within the Georgian state border in Adjara as well as in South Ossetia and Abkhazia, since the Georgian identity parameters of Orthodoxy and Westernness are challenged in those territories. Analyzing these complex links, the author discusses how Russia and Turkey can contain elements of identification with and differentiation from Georgianness simultaneously. Furthermore,

Colmorgen explores how othering is transmitted to objects within the internationally recognized Georgian territory, when, for example, Adjara, South Ossetia, and Abkhazia, are perceived to be insufficiently Orthodox or Western. The author explains how such complex othering patterns in Georgia might be found in conflicts within the Georgian self. Discussing how Georgia's identity is formed between the extreme poles of Westernness and Orthodoxy, questions of how much Westernness is tolerable for Georgian Orthodoxy and to what degree Orthodoxy can be part of a Westernized Georgian society are not only key to understanding the current Georgian self, but to contextualizing relations to Russia, Turkey, South Ossetia, Abkhazia and Adjara respectively.

In the next chapter, Nadiia Koval and Ivan Gomza analyze the development of Ukrainian IR (International Relations) sociology and its theoretical and ideological limitations. In particular, the authors look at the degree of Ukrainian scholars' integration in the global IR community, their favorite theories and methods, and their lack of influence on policymakers. Based on the TRIP-2017 survey data analysis, the authors discovered that, due to Soviet tradition and partial Westernization, Ukrainian IR scholars tend to espouse realism and constructivism as their preferred IR paradigms; they prefer to use descriptive methods, and their area studies focus is primarily on the CEE region and Western Europe. Their policy and political influence are minimal, and their involvement with the global community of IR scholars is limited. On the whole, Ukrainian IR scholars enjoy little prestige domestically and cannot effectively prevent the "double peripheralization" of Ukrainian IR studies.

Augusto Dala Costa narrates a massive renaming in Tbilisi, which took place from 1988 to 2007. The author emphasizes that the toponymic changes in Georgia's capital reflect the political transformations of the time and accord with the post-Soviet national discourse of Georgia. Drawing upon the data previously not translated from the Georgian language, Costa detects the points where the national discourse meets Tbilisi's local history and highlights a selective nature of commemoration of early independence. Replacing ninety percent of Soviet personal names with the same number of

place names memorializing Georgian historical figures, the authorities performed a “Georgianization” of the capital, incorporating not only cultural but also religious and ethnic elements into its cityscape. Deprived of local peculiar traits, the toponymic portrait of Tbilisi depicts the whole of Georgia as a homogeneous monoethnic nation whose unity is secured by the commemoration of national historical events and figures, which its capital readily illustrates. This national discourse characterizes the Menshevik nature of the First Republic, the local minorities of the Armenians and Azeris, and even the shared Transcaucasian history erased from the post-Soviet Tbilisi cityscape. Reconfigured in such a way, the symbolic landscape of Georgia’s capital reflects the politics of the then Georgian leaders – Zviad Gamsakhurdia and Mikheil Saakashvili – and brings about “the democratic expression of power from the Georgian nation,” while also cultivating its self-perception as it shapes Georgian national identity defined by the political agenda of the time.

Finally, a chapter authored by Roman Horbyk, Yana Prymachenko and Yuliya Yurchuk analyzes the mediatization of the sphere of public history, which has become a mainstream trend in Central and Eastern Europe. To some extent, this was provoked by the policies of the Russian government, which actively used historical arguments to justify aggressive foreign policy. Based on the theory of mediatization and collective memory studies, the authors consider relevant processes throughout the region and then consider the case of Likbez, a public initiative of Ukrainian historians aimed at refuting historical myths both in and around Ukraine. The authors highlight the general trend of the government losing its exclusive role in interpreting and representing the historical past. They also note that the use of media technologies affects the status of professional historians. On the one hand, it leads to a blurring of professional standards; on the other hand, it promotes giving the “meaning-producers” direct access to the target audience, where they enter into competition with other actors, including the political class and government bureaucracy.

The second part of this book is dedicated to sovereignty and the comparison of its manifestations in post-Soviet and Western

societies. The international order has recently entered a period in which national elites and popular movements have risen up against universalism and advocated for the supremacy of their government and individual state's interests—a phenomenon referred to as sovereignty. If in earlier years, the global order was challenged mainly by radical left and right groups that had little impact on the norms and principles of the global agenda, the primary challenge to universal norms of justice and human rights today comes from the ruling groups of some of the world's largest powers and economies.

The chapters of this part focus on a number of questions stemming from the ideological divide between universalism and sovereignty. How did sovereignists become so influential on the national and international stage? Can international peace and human rights norms survive in a world-system of national exceptionalism? What are the potential implications of continuing down the current path of divisions between universalism and sovereignty?

In their opening chapter, Oleksandr Fisun and Nataliya Vynykova look at the controversy over universalism and sovereignty as part of a wider theoretical debate over the fate of state sovereignty and democracy. The authors argue that sovereignty is going through a period of de-etatization: real policymaking is now being done in network formats, where the role of non-state stakeholders causes the state to lose its sovereign monopoly on decision-making and undermines state legitimacy. They also show how post-Soviet—Ukrainian—ideological creativity became influential for understanding contemporary politics in more distant countries.

Ruslan Zaporozhchenko continues the discussion by stating that in times of globalism, sovereignty consolidates the instruments and practices of populism, particularism, nationalism, or separatism, in varying combinations, to deconstruct the existing sovereign system of power nationally and internationally. Such a deconstruction may catalyze protest movements, revolutions, civil wars, or mass rallies, which in turn may lead to a further (re)production of divisions within the political systems and regional orders.

In the following chapter, I offer an analysis of the concept of sovereignty as promoted by contemporary sovereigntists. I argue that although the sovereigntist ideology varies from country to country, it is consolidated around a specific interpretation of the concept of sovereignty. Taking as examples Trumpism and Putinism, the sovereigntist ideologies in an old democracy and a new post-Soviet autocracy, I show that sovereigntists define sovereignty as the supremacy of the people as an imagined majority, a perspective that denies the sovereignty of the human person and the legitimacy of cosmopolitan norms of justice.

Gulnara Shaikhutdinova examines how international human rights law is experiencing a sovereigntist and nationalist turn in domestic legal systems, adducing the legal systems of the EU, Germany, Italy, the UK, and Russia as examples. The author argues that the sovereigntist trend in implementing international human rights law leads to the fragmentation of contemporary international law and the emergence of multiple legal values and practices that contradict each other and the international legal order.

In the concluding chapter, Yurii Mielkov contends that universal norms take precedence over a particularist ethos and provides a framework for any moral particularity that could serve to achieve more peaceful and just universal goals for the world. Using arguments from post-Soviet experience, the author argues that moral particularism can only lead to a world of closed societies, with little space in the national and international public sphere.

On the whole, the selected research provides our readers with many specific cases of post-Soviet majority construction, with their attendant insights, as well as a general account of ideological creativity.

Bibliography

- Adams, Jacqueline (2004). *The Imagination and Social Life. Qualitative Sociology* 27(3): 277–297.
- Arendt, Hannah (1960). *Vita activa oder Vom tätigen Leben*. Bonn: Paul.
- Arendt, Hannah (1963). *On Revolution*. New York: Penguin.
- Aristotle. (1964). *On the Soul. Parva Naturalia. On Breath*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.